



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,570	05/02/2001	Steve Wai Leung	25821p032	5623
8791	7590	09/20/2004	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN				NGUYEN, KIMNHUNG T
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD				ART UNIT
SEVENTH FLOOR				PAPER NUMBER
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030				2674

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/847,570	LEUNG ET AL.	
	Examiner Kimnhung Nguyen	Art Unit 2674	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Application has been examined. The claims 1-3 and 5-20 are pending. The examination results are as following.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3 and 5-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masazumi (US 6,414,669) in view of Kim et al. (US 6,373,457).

As per claims 1, 5, and 6, Masazumi teaches a driving method for a liquid crystal display (LCD) device in which a liquid crystal exhibiting a cholesteric phase is sandwiched between two substrates having electrodes arranged in a matrix form on their substrates (col. 1, lines 12-17), providing pixels arranged in a matrix array (see abstract, line 7), providing a reset pulse and a select pulse signal is applied for every line (plurality of selection pulses) to provide pulse voltages of the waveforms (a), (b) and (c) shown in fig. 5 and the resulting (f) waveform applied to the liquid crystal (col. 23, line 60 to col. 25, line 3). Further, the selection pulse taught by Masazumi may consist of a pipeline and non-pipeline arrangement and also of partial rows that are pipelined and non-pipelined (fig. 5). Masazumi does not teach a multiplex addressing driving

waveform. Kim et al teach a multiplexer (see figure 3, see MUX 1 addressing driving waveform, see figure 1) that selectively changes the signal in accordance with the switching control signal (fig. 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the multiplex addressing driving waveform as taught by Kim et al into the device of Masazumi because it would reduce the voltage requirements for the driver circuits by providing the ability to multiplex address and data over a single bus and therefore decreasing power dissipation of the system.

As per claim 2, Masazumi teaches a select pulse signal for every line (plurality of selection pulses) wherein a pulse width modulation (PWM circuit) capable of varying the pulse width for reproduction of 256 gray scale levels (col. 19, lines 44-46).

As per claim 3, Masazumi teaches a select pulse signal for every line (plurality of selection pulses) that have inherent variable amplitudes as claimed (see fig. 5).

As per claims 7 and 8, Masazumi teaches a reset pulse signal (col. 23, lines 65-66) and a reset voltage period (col. 10, line 61) but does not explicitly state that the reset pulses are no smaller in value than the reset voltage and the reset pulses are greater than the reset voltage. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to specifically utilize the values of the reset pulses as claimed because it would obtain the needed amount of voltages for a cholesteric liquid crystal material to select the display state of the liquid crystal in every pixel thereby improving the matrix driving.

As per claims 9 and 10, Kim et al teach a multiplexer (multiplex addressing driving waveform) that selectively changes the signal in accordance with the switching control signal

(fig. 3) and wherein the selection pulses of the multiplex driving waveform can be arranged in groups selected from clustering together, interleaving with other rows, and a combination of said clustering and said interleaving.

As per claim 11, Masazumi teaches driving waveform(s) that have polarity inversion after each pulse in the driving waveform as claimed (col. 16, lines 29, 30, fig. 13).

As per claim 12, Masazumi teaches voltages opposite in polarity but equal in magnitude that are constantly applied to the liquid crystal layer during the deselect (frame) period (col. 16, lines 52-54).

As per claim 13, Masazumi teaches at least some of the pulses of the driving waveform that are polarity reversed in the frame period by applying positive and negative voltages that are applied alternately (col. 16, lines 61-63).

As per claim 14, Masazumi teaches a method wherein the polarity of a succeeding pulse of the driving waveform is opposite the polarity of the immediately preceding (instant) pulse as claimed (see $+V_c/2$ in fig. 16).

As per claim 15, Masazumi teaches a selection pulse for each line (multiple selection lines) wherein the pulses of a succeeding frame periods is different from the instant pulse (see $+V_c/2$ in fig. 18).

As per claim 17, Masazumi teaches cases where gray scale is reproduced by varying the voltage value of the waveform (s) (col. 16, line 67 to col. 17, line 1).

As per claims 18 and 19, Masazumi teaches in the waveform during the reset period a voltage V_{th1} for setting the liquid crystal into the homeotropic state that is first applied for a duration of time 0 and then the voltage is held below a threshold voltage V_{th2} for a duration of

time t4 for setting the liquid crystal into the planar state. Further, Masazumi teaches a voltage greater than Vth2 and smaller than Vth1 to cause the liquid crystal in the planar state to change to the focal conic state. To achieve gray scale levels, the entire reset period t3+t4+t5 can be made shorter than t1 (col. 14, lines 20-41).

As per claims 16 and 20, Masazumi teaches a resulting (f) waveform (common waveform) applied to the liquid crystal which is a combination of waveforms as claimed (fig. 5).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 4/2/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Masazumi and Kim do not teach "an array of pixels", "a reset pulse and a plurality of selection pulse", and "a multiplex addressing driving". However, examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because Masazumi discloses "an array of pixels" (see abstract), "a reset pulse and a plurality of selection pulse" (see a plurality of selection pulse, figure 5). Masazumi does not disclose a multiplex addressing driving waveform. Kim discloses, "a multiplex addressing driving" (see a MUX1 of figure 3 driving wave form of figure 1). Therefore, the combination of Masazumi and Kim are satisfied for its intended purpose. For these reasons, the rejections are maintained.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimnhung Nguyen whose telephone number (703) 308-0425.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **RICHARD A HJERPE** can be reached on (703) 305-4709.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D. C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only).

Hand-delivery response should be brought to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Kimnhung Nguyen
September 18, 2004



RICHARD HJERPE 9/20/04
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600